

Applicants : Joseph Z. Sleiman et al  
Serial No. : 10/719,636  
Page No. : 2

identified inventors and the common assignee, indicating that they agree with the change of inventorship.

As a result of the inventorship change in the '375 patent, both the '375 patent and the present application have the same inventive entity. Therefore, the '375 patent is not "by another" as required under 35 U.S.C. 102(e), and does not constitute prior art under Section 102(e).

Because the '375 patent does not constitute prior art under Section 102(e), Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection under Section 102(e) should be withdrawn.

### III. Conclusion

In view of the change in inventorship in the '375 patent, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance. A notice to that effect is earnestly and respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

JOSEPH Z. SLEIMAN ET AL

By: Warner Norcross & Judd LLP



Chad E. Kleinheksel

Registration No. 53 141

900 Fifth Third Center

111 Lyon Street, NW

Grand Rapids, MI 49503-2487

(616) 752-2313